

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-31 are pending, Claim 1 having been amended, and Claims 7-31 having been withdrawn from consideration.

In the outstanding Office Action the specification was objected to; Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101; and Claims 1-6 were rejected as being anticipated by Mattaway et al (U.S. Patent 6,131,121, hereinafter "Mattaway").

In reply, a substitute specification is filed herewith, which addresses the spacing between words, and the spacing between lines, as requested in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the outstanding Office Action.

Claim 1 has been amended. The outstanding Office Action recognizes that such objects cannot tangibly embody a data processing system since the data processing system would fail to produce a tangible result. In reply, Applicants first recognize that the term "chain objects" is to be construed broadly. However, to address the rejection, Claim 1 is amended to state that one of the one or more chain objects has a data processing capability. It is believed that this description and amendment to Claim 1 places Claims 1-6 in compliance with 35 U.S.C. §101. However, if the Examiner disagrees, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned so that mutually agreeable claim language may be identified.

In reviewing the assertion that Mattaway anticipates Claim 1, it appears as though there is some misunderstanding regarding what is claimed in Claim 1. Therefore Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the subject matter. The system includes a chain directory, which stores in memory correspondence data and performs and executable service retrieval process. The correspondence data includes chain manager IDs and chain object IDs, the storage of data input and/or data output services associated with the chain objects, and the file formats

and/or data types used with those services. The executable service retrieval process matches the file formats and/or data types and matches the data services as well. A routine manager then is able to perform a query process, to develop the linkages between particular chain managers and chain object IDs, which is ultimately recorded in the chain directory. This linkage enables the interaction of different chain objects, as well as perhaps chain managers, that have common attributes so that compatible processes and data may be shared between the different chain objects. Furthermore, the chain manager ID and the chain object ID have identifiers that are defined in address spaces different from one another. Therefore, these manager IDs and the chain object IDs are distinct and can serve distinct functions based on a particular item's attributes as a "chain object", or a particular "chain manager", which is able to serve as a communication linkage between compatible chain objects.

In contrast to amended Claim 1, Mattaway is directed to a point-to-point computer network with dynamically assigned network protocol addresses. The Office Action appears to be relying on Mattaway's use of e-mail messages, as being descriptive of creating a chain directory and root chain manager as claimed. For example, the outstanding Office Action relies on the discussion (at column 7, lines 25-30) regarding a first processing unit querying a connection server with an e-mail address of a callee. This connection server then searches the database to determine whether the callee is logged on by finding any stored information corresponding to the callee's e-mail address indicating that the callee is active and online. However, despite the assertion at the top of page 7, this language neither teaches nor suggests that the correspondence data and executable service retrieval process at the change directory as claimed, is taught or suggested by Mattaway. In particular, Mattaway does not perform a process of matching the file formats and/or data types and matching the data input and data output services of the chain objects, which later would be used then by a routine manager to inquire whether during a query to the chain directory, a particular chain object has the same

file format and/or data type with a chain object with the required ID. Moreover, there is simply not the same association of both the chain objects, and the chain managers that are associated with those chain objects, as reflected in a chain directory (as claimed) and then having that chain directory available for queries by way of a route chain manager. As not all of the features of amended Claim 1 are found in Mattaway, it is respectfully submitted that Mattaway does not anticipate amended Claim 1. As each of Claims 2-6 depend from amended Claim 1 it is respectfully submitted that these claims also patentably define over Mattaway.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-6, as amended, define statutory subject matter, and is patentably distinguishing over the prior art. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 03/06)  
BDL/rac/ma



---

Bradley D. Lytle  
Registration No. 40,073